arXiv:1512.07430v1 [cs.DB] 23 Dec 2015

# The ERA of FOLE: Foundation

Robert E. Kent

Ontologos

**Abstract.** This paper discusses the representation of ontologies in the first-order logical environment FOLE (Kent [8]). An ontology defines the primitives with which to model the knowledge resources for a community of discourse (Gruber [6]). These primitives, consisting of classes, relationships and properties, are represented by the entity-relationship-attribute ERA data model (Chen [2]). An ontology uses formal axioms to constrain the interpretation of these primitives. In short, an ontology specifies a logical theory. This paper is the first in a series of three papers that provide a rigorous mathematical representation for the ERA data model in particular, and ontologies in general, within the first-order logical environment FOLE. The first two papers show how FOLE represents the formalism and semantics of (many-sorted) first-order logic in a classification form corresponding to ideas discussed in the Information Flow Framework (IFF [13]). In particular, this first paper provides a *foundation* that connects elements of the ERA data model with components of the first-order logical environment FOLE, and the second paper (Kent [9]) provides a *superstructure* that extends FOLE to the formalisms of first-order logic. The third paper (Kent [10]) defines an *interpretation* of FOLE in terms of the transformational passage, first described in Kent [8], from the classification form of first-order logic to an equivalent interpretation form, thereby defining the formalism and semantics of first-order logical/relational database systems (Kent [7]). The FOLE representation follows a conceptual structures approach, that is completely compatible with formal concept analysis (Ganter and Wille [3]) and information flow (Barwise and Seligman [1]).

**Keywords:** entity, attribute, relationship, schema, universe, structure.

# Table of Contents


The ERA of FOLE: Foundation . . . . . 1
*Robert E. Kent*
1 Introduction . . . . . 3
2 Overview . . . . . 4
3 ERA Data Model . . . . . 7
3.1 Attributes. . . . . 7
3.2 Entities. . . . . 7
3.3 Relations. . . . . 8
4 FOLE Components . . . . . 9
4.1 Schema. . . . . 9
4.2 Universe. . . . . 10
4.3 Structure. . . . . 11
4.4 Interpretation. . . . . 17
5 Connections . . . . . 19
5.1 Analogy. . . . . 19
5.2 Linearization. . . . . 20
6 Conclusion . . . . . 23
A The Fibered Context of Structures. . . . . 24
A.1 An Exemplar. . . . . 25
A.2 Schema Orientation. . . . . 26
A.3 Universe Orientation. . . . . 28

# 1 Introduction

The first-order logical environment FOLE (Kent [8]) is a framework for defining the semantics and formalism of logic and databases in an integrated and coherent fashion. Institutions in general, and logical environments in particular, give equivalent heterogeneous and homogeneous representations for logical systems. FOLE is an institution, since "satisfaction is invariant under change of notation". FOLE is a logical environment, since "satisfaction respects structure linkage". As an institution, the architecture of FOLE consists of languages as indexing components, structures to represent semantic content, specifications to represent formal content, and logics to combine formalism with semantics. FOLE structures are interpreted as relational/logical databases. This is the first of three papers, which are concerned with the presentation of FOLE: (1) the FOLE foundation, (2) the FOLE superstructure (Kent [9]), and (3) the FOLE interpretation (Kent [10]).

This paper, which is concerned with the FOLE foundation, is illustrated in Fig. 7 and is centered on the mathematical context of structures. [1] In § 3 and § 4 we show how the ERA data model is represented in FOLE by connecting elements of the ERA data model to components of the FOLE structure concept. § 3 discusses the direct lower-level connection between the ERA elements (attributes, entities, relations) and the FOLE components (type domains and entity classifications). [2] § 4 discusses the abstract higher-level representation of the ERA data model within the FOLE architecture. In addition, we give a rudimentary description of the interpretation of FOLE structures in § 4.4. In § 5 we connect FOLE to Sowa's knowledge representation hierarchy (Sowa [11]) and through linearization to the Olog data model (Spivak and Kent [12]).

The FOLE superstructure, which is concern with the formalism and semantics of first-order logic, and the FOLE interpretation, which is concerned with database interpretation, are presented in the two papers that follow this one. Two further papers are pending on the integration of federated systems of knowledge: one discusses integration over a fixed type domain and the other discusses integration over a fixed universe.

Fig. 1 : ERA Data Model in FOLE
Fig. 2 : Example
Fig. 3 : Structure
Fig. 4 : Interpreted Structure
Fig. 5 : Structure Morphism
Fig. 6 : Interpreted Structure Morphism
Fig. 7 : FOLE Foundation
Fig. 8 : Analogy

Tbl. 1 : FOLE-ERA Correspondence
Tbl. 2 : Matrix of six central categories

Figures and Tables

[1] Following the original discussion of FOLE (Kent [8]), we use "mathematical context" (Goguen [4]) for the mathematical term "category", "passage" for the term "functor", and "bridge" for the term "natural transformation".

[2] The theory of classifications and infomorphisms is discussed in the book *Information Flow* by Barwise and Seligman [1].

## 2 Overview

A conceptual model for a community represents the information needed by the community — the content, relationships and constraints necessary to describe the community. The content consists of things of significance to the community (entities), and characteristics of those things (attributes). The relationships are associations between those things. The entities are the core concepts that are used for representing the semantics of the community. Entities are described by attributes, which are the various properties, characteristics, modifiers, aspects or features of entities. Hence, the entity-relationship-attribute (ERA) formalism is a ternary representation for knowledge, since it uses three kinds for representation: entities, attributes and relations. In contrast, the first-order logical environment FOLE (Kent [8]) followed the knowledge representation approach of traditional many-sorted first-order logic (MSFOL). Both the original FOLE formalism and the MSFOL formalism are binary representations for knowledge, since they use two kinds for representation: entities and relations.

*Revised FOLE Terminology.* However, the first-order logical environment FOLE can very naturally represent the ERA data model. The idea is that the original FOLE relation represented a nexus of roles, where the roles were played by the original FOLE entities. In order to represent the ERA data model, we think of the original FOLE relations as the new FOLE entities described by a nexus of features or aspects, where the aspects are represented by the new FOLE attributes, which replace the original FOLE entities. In the FOLE representation of the ERA data model, entities and their attributes are primary notions, whereas relationships are secondary notions that are subsumed by other constructs. Some relations (foreign keys, subtypes, sums, ...) have a special representation in FOLE; whereas, other relations can be resolved into concepts (entities) with a nexus of roles.

Tbl. 1 shows the terminological correspondence between the basic components of (old/new) FOLE and ERA. For example, the original FOLE entity type is renamed the new FOLE attribute type (sort), and this corresponds to the ERA attribute type (data type); and the original FOLE relation instance is renamed the new FOLE entity instance (key), and this corresponds to the ERA entity.

| FOLE (old) | | FOLE (new) | | ERA |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| relation | $\simeq$ | entity | $\sim$ | entity |
| entity | $\simeq$ | attribute | $\sim$ | attribute |

**Table 1.** FOLE-ERA Correspondence

*Philosophy: the ERA of FOLE.* As commonly observed, an entity is a thing capable of an independent existence that can be uniquely identified. In natural language, an entity corresponds to a noun. A relationship links entities, and corresponds to

a verb in natural language. Entities and relationships can both have attributes. In natural language, a relational attribute corresponds to a role or case. Inclusion and subtype relationships are special kinds of relationships. A data model can be visualized in terms of entities, relationships and attributes. But in general, relationships can be conceptualized by being converted to entities.

Hence, a data model is more simply conceptualized in terms of entities and attributes. When doing so, there is an implied boundary around the visualization, which converts an entity's collection of attributes into a list (possibly infinite in size or arity); a signature is the list of attribute types (sorts) associated with an entity type, whereas a tuple is the list of attribute instances (values) associated with an entity instance (key). Entity types can be mapped to the associated signature, and entity instances (primary keys) identify and can be mapped to the associated tuple (horizontal dimension of Fig. 1). In general, types classify instances. Hence, entity types classify keys and sorts classify values (vertical dimension of Fig. 1). Implicit from the ERA data model is an entity type system and multi-sorted logic, which uses boolean operators and quantification, and is defined in terms of signature-based fibers of formulas (queries) in Kent [9].




**Fig. 1.** ERA Data Model in FOLE

In review, the simplest way to handle *things* is **first** to distinguish *types* from *instances* along the FOLE classification dimension in Fig. 1, and **second** to view things (either types or instances) as participating in Whitehead's fundamental prehension relationship (Sowa [11]) along the FOLE hypergraph dimension in Fig. 1, which links a prehending thing called an *entity* to a prehended thing called an *attribute*: "an entity has an attribute". The ERA data model of FOLE uses an inclusive prehension for things; hence, it is a mixed data model; some entities are not attributes, some attributes are not entities, and some are both. For any type in the overlap $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{A}$, any instance of that type is also in the overlap. Foreign keys are examples of things that are both entities and attributes, things in the overlap.

$\mathcal{E}$ : entities
$\mathcal{A}$ : attributes




*Disjoint Model* *Mixed Model* *Unified Model*

# 3 ERA Data Model

## 3.1 Attributes.

In the ERA data model, attributes are represented by a typed domain consisting of a collection of data types. In FOLE, a typed domain is represented by an attribute classification $\mathcal{A} = \langle X, Y, \models_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ consisting of a set of attribute types (sorts) $X$, a set of attribute instances (data values) $Y$ and an attribute classification relation $\models_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq X \times Y$. For each sort (attribute type) $x \in X$, the data domain of that type is the $\mathcal{A}$-extent $\mathcal{A}_x = \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \{y \in Y \mid y \models_{\mathcal{A}} x\}$. The passage $X \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}}} \wp Y$ maps a sort $x \in X$ to its data domain ($\mathcal{A}$-extent) $\mathcal{A}_x \subseteq Y$.

An $X$-signature (header) is a sort list $\langle I, s \rangle$, where $I \xrightarrow{s} X$ is a map from an indexing set (arity) $I$ to the set of sorts $X$. A more visual representation for this signature is $(\cdots s_i \cdots \mid i \in I)$. The mathematical context of $X$-signatures is $\mathbf{List}(X)$. [3] [4] A $Y$-tuple (row) is an list of data values $\langle J, t \rangle$, where $J \xrightarrow{t} Y$ is a map from an indexing set (arity) $J$ to the set of data values $Y$. A more visual representation for this tuple is $(\cdots t_j \cdots \mid j \in J)$. The mathematical context of $Y$-tuples is $\mathbf{List}(Y)$. The attribute list classification $\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A}) = \langle \mathbf{List}(X), \mathbf{List}(Y), \models_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})} \rangle$ has $X$-signatures as types and $Y$-tuples as instances, with classification by common arity and universal $\mathcal{A}$-classification: a $Y$-tuple $\langle J, t \rangle$ is classified by an $X$-signature $\langle I, s \rangle$ when $J = I$ and $t_k \models_{\mathcal{A}} s_k$ for all $k \in J = I$.

## 3.2 Entities.

We distinguish between an entity instance and an entity type. An entity type is a category of existence; entity types classify entity instances. There might be many instances of an entity type, and an entity instance can be classified by many types. An entity instance (entity, for short) is also called an object. Every entity is uniquely identified by a key. In FOLE, entities and their types are collected together locally in an entity classification $\mathcal{E} = \langle R, K, \models_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle$ consisting of a set of entity types $R$, a set of entity instances (keys) $K$ and an entity classification relation $\models_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq R \times K$. In the database interpretation in §4.4, each entity type $r \in R$ is regarded to be the name for a relation (or table) in the database: for each entity type (relation name) $r \in R$, the set of primary keys for that type is the $\mathcal{E}$-extent $\mathcal{E}_r = \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) = \{k \in K \mid k \models_{\mathcal{E}} r\}$.

---

[3] $\mathbf{List}(X)$ is the comma context $\mathbf{List}(X) = (\mathbf{Set} \downarrow X)$ of $X$-signatures, where an object $\langle I, s \rangle$ is an $X$-signature and a morphism $\langle I', s' \rangle \xrightarrow{h} \langle I, s \rangle$ is an arity function $I' \xrightarrow{h} I$ that preserves signatures $h \cdot s = s'$; visually, $(\cdots s'_{i'} \cdots \mid i' \in I') = (\cdots s_{h(i')} \cdots \mid i' \in I')$.

[4] The header for a database table is a signature (list of sorts) $\langle I, s \rangle \in \mathbf{List}(X)$. Pairs $(i : s_i)$ from a signature $\langle I, s \rangle$ are called attributes (see § 4.1). Examples of attributes are '`(name : Str)`', '`(age : Natno)`'.

### 3.3 Relations.

Here we discuss how the relational aspect of the ERA data model is handled in FOLE. Some relations are special. One example is subtyping, which specifies that one category of existence is more general than another. This arises when representing the taxonomic aspect of ontologies. Subtyping is handled by the binary sequents [5] in FOLE specifications (discussed further in the (Kent [9])). Some many-to-one relationships can be represented as attributes. But in general, many-to-many relationships are represented in FOLE as entities, whose attributes, each of which plays a thematic role for the relationship, may be other entities. [6]

Consider the example (Fig. 2) of a simple entity-relationship-attribute diagram. Here we have three entities (represented by rectangles), two relationships (represented by diamonds) and numerous attributes (represented by ovals). The *works_on* relationship is many-to-many, and so we can represent this in FOLE as an entity type *Activity* with four attributes: *entry_date* of sort *Date*, *job_descr* of sort *String*, *employee* of sort *Employee*, and *project* of sort *Project*. Note that attributes *employee* and *project* are foreign keys of the *Activity* entity. [7] Since the *works_for* relationship is many-to-one without any attributes of its own, we can represent this as an attribute called *dept* of sort *Department*. This is a foreign key of the *Employee* entity.




**Fig. 2.** Example

[5] A sequent $\varphi \vdash \psi$ expresses interpretation widening between formulas.

[6] As an example, the "marriage" binary relation can be represented as a *Marriage* entity with *wife* and *husband* attributes that are themselves *Person* entities.

[7] The *Employee* type, which plays the *employee* thematic role for the *works_on* relationship, is both an entity type and an attribute type (sort); any value in the *Employee* data domain is a key of the *Employee* entity and a foreign key of the *Activity* entity.

# 4 FOLE Components

## 4.1 Schema.

The type aspect of the ERA data model is gathered together into a schema. A *schema* $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X \rangle$ consists of a set of sorts (attribute types) $X$, a set of entity types $R$ and a signature map $R \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{List}(X)$. Within the schema $\mathcal{S}$, we think of each $r \in R$ as being an entity type that is locally described by the associated $X$-signature $\sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle \in \mathbf{List}(X)$. [8] A more visual representation for this signature mapping is $r \overset{\sigma}{\mapsto} (\cdots s_i \cdots \mid i \in I)$. An ERA-style visualization might be $\boxed{r} \xrightarrow{i} \textcircled{s_i}$, where the box encloses the entity type $r \in R$, the oval encloses the attribute type $s_i \in X$, and the arrow is labeled with the index $i \in I$. For example, $\boxed{\texttt{Person}} \xrightarrow{\texttt{name}} \textcircled{\texttt{String}}$ or $\boxed{\texttt{Employee}} \xrightarrow{\texttt{dept}} \textcircled{\texttt{Department}}$.

The entity type $r$ in the ERA data model corresponds to the relation symbol $r$ in FOLE/MSFOL. Either representation is a kind of nexus. A schema corresponds to a multi-sorted first-order logical language in the FOLE/MSFOL approach to knowledge representation. [9] In the database interpretation of FOLE (Kent [10]), we think of $r$ as being a relation name with associated header $\sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle$.

We formally link schemas with morphisms. A *schema morphism* $\mathcal{S}_2 = \langle R_2, \sigma_2, X_2 \rangle \overset{\langle r, f \rangle}{\Longrightarrow} \langle R_1, \sigma_1, X_1 \rangle = \mathcal{S}_1$ from schema $\mathcal{S}_2$ to schema $\mathcal{S}_1$ consists of an sort function $f : X_2 \to X_1$ and an entity type function $r : R_2 \to R_1$, which preserve signatures by satisfying the condition $r \cdot \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \cdot \sum_f$.

$$\mathcal{S}_2 \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} r_2 \in R_2 & \xmapsto{r} & r(r_2) \in R_1 \\ \sigma_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma_1 \\ \langle I, s \rangle = (\cdots s_i \cdots \mid i \in I) & \xmapsto{\sum_f} & (\cdots f(s_i) \cdots \mid i \in I) = \sum_f (I, s) \\ s_i \in X_2 & & f(s_i) \in X_1 \end{array} \right\} \mathcal{S}_2$$

Let **Sch** denote the mathematical context of schemas and their morphisms.

---

[8] There is an associated arity function $R \xrightarrow[\sigma \circ \mathit{set}]{\alpha} \mathbf{Set} : r \overset{\sigma}{\mapsto} \langle I, s \rangle \overset{\mathit{set}}{\longmapsto} I$.

[9] Formulas based on relation symbols can be inductively defined, thus forming extended schemas (Kent [9]). Terms composed of function symbols can be added as constraints between formulas.

### 4.2 Universe.

The instance aspect of the ERA data model is gathered together into a universe. A *universe* $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle$ consists of a set of values (attribute instances) $Y$, a set of keys (entity instances) $K$ and a tuple map $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y)$. Within the universe $\mathcal{U}$, we think of each key $k \in K$ as being an identifier or name for an object that is locally described by the associated tuple of values $\tau(k) = \langle J, t \rangle \in \mathbf{List}(Y)$. A more visual representation for this tuple mapping is $k \overset{\tau}{\mapsto} (\cdots t_j \cdots \mid j \in J)$. Note that, no typing has been mentioned here and no typing restrictions are required. In a universe by itself, we do not require the data values $t_j$ to be members of any special data-types.

An element of a universe $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle \in \mathbf{Univ}$ is a key $\big(k \overset{\tau}{\mapsto} \langle J, t \rangle\big)$ with associated list. We can think of such universe elements as object descriptions without attached typing or as tuples untethered from a database table. They develop meaning by being classified by schema elements $\big(r \overset{\sigma}{\mapsto} \langle I, s \rangle\big)$ in a structure (§ 4.3). [10] Hence, a FOLE universe is like the key−value·list store at the heart of Google's Spanner database (Google [5]):

> *"Spanner's data model is not purely relational, in that rows must have names. More precisely, every table is required to have an ordered set of one or more primary-key columns. This requirement is where Spanner still looks like a key-value store: the primary keys form the name for a row, and each table defines a mapping from the primary-key columns to the non-primary-key columns."* [11]

We semantically link universes with morphisms. A *universe morphism* $\mathcal{U}_2 = \langle K_2, \tau_2, Y_2 \rangle \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\Longleftarrow} \langle K_1, \tau_1, Y_1 \rangle = \mathcal{U}_1$ consists of a value (attribute instance) function $Y_2 \overset{g}{\leftarrow} Y_1$ and a key (entity instance) function $K_2 \overset{k}{\leftarrow} K_1$, which preserve tuples (instance lists) by satisfying the condition $k \cdot \tau_2 = \tau_1 \cdot \sum_g$.

$$\mathcal{U}_2 \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} k(k_1) \in K_2 & \xleftarrow{\ k\ } & k_1 \in K_1 \\ \tau_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau_1 \\ \sum_g(J,t) = (\cdots g(t_j) \cdots \mid j \in J) & \xleftarrow{\ \sum_g\ } & (\cdots t_j \cdots \mid j \in J) = \langle J, t \rangle \\ g(t_j) \in Y_2 & & t_j \in Y_1 \end{array} \right\} \mathcal{U}_1$$

Let **Univ** denote the mathematical context of universes and their morphisms.

---

[10] They are somewhat like genes (bits of DNA) without the genomic structure that provides interpretation.

[11] When the universe $\mathcal{U}$ is the instance aspect of a FOLE structure $\mathcal{M}$ with typed domain $\mathcal{A}$, in the database interpretation of that structure (§ 4.4 and Kent [10]), we think of the entity instance $k$ as being a primary key that indexes a row $\tau(k) = \langle I, t \rangle$ in the table associated with the relation symbol $r \in R$ with associated header $\sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle$. A more visual representation for this tuple mapping is $k \overset{\tau}{\mapsto} (\cdots t_i \cdots \mid i \in I, t_i \in \mathcal{A}_{s_i})$, where $\mathcal{A}_{s_i}$ is the data-type for sort $s_i \in X$. Here, we do require the data values $t_i$ to be members of the special data-types $\mathcal{A}_{s_i}$.

### 4.3 Structure.

The complete ERA data model is incorporated into the notion of a (model-theoretic) structure in the FOLE representation of knowledge.

*Structures.* A FOLE *structure* $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{E}, \sigma, \tau, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is a hypergraph of classifications (Fig. 3) — a two-dimensional construct with the following components:

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| attribute classification: | *typed domain* | $\mathcal{A}$ | = | $\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M})$ | = | $\langle X, Y, \models_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ |
| entity classification: | | $\mathcal{E}$ | = | $\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M})$ | = | $\langle R, K, \models_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle$ |
| type hypergraph: | *schema* | $\mathcal{S}$ | = | $\boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M})$ | = | $\langle R, \sigma, X \rangle$ |
| instance hypergraph: | *universe* | $\mathcal{U}$ | = | $\boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M})$ | = | $\langle K, \tau, Y \rangle$ |

and a list designation $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle : \mathcal{E} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})$ with signature map $R \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{List}(X)$ and tuple map $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y)$, whose defining condition states that: if entity $k \in K$ is of type $r \in R$, then the description tuple $\tau(k) = \langle J, t \rangle$ is the same "size" ($J = I$) as the signature $\sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle$ and each data value $t_n$ is of sort $s_n$; or interpretively (§ 4.4 and Kent [10]), in a database table all rows are classified by the table header. A FOLE structure embodies the idea of an ERA data model




**Fig. 3.** Structure

(compare Fig. 3 with Fig. 1). Each community of discourse that incorporates the ERA data model will have its own local FOLE structure. [12]

The entity and attribute-list classifications $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})$ are equivalent [13] to their extent diagrams $R \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}} \mathbf{Set}$ and $\mathbf{List}(X) \xrightarrow[\boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}]{\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathbf{Set}$, and the list designation is equivalent to its extent diagram morphism $\boldsymbol{ext}_{\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle} = \langle \sigma, \tau_{\llcorner} \rangle : \langle R, \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle \to \langle \mathbf{List}(X), \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})} \rangle$ consisting of the signature map $R \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{List}(X)$

[12] In anticipation of the discussion in § 4.4, we illustrate the associated tabular interpretation (3) on the right side of Fig. 3.

[13] Any classification $\mathcal{A} = \langle X, Y, \models_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ is equivalent to its extent map $X \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}}} \wp Y$.

and the bridge $\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}} \overset{\tau_{\mathsf{L}}}{\Longrightarrow} \sigma \circ \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}$, whose $r^{\text{th}}$-component is the tuple function $K(r) = \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) \overset{\tau_r}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}(\sigma(r)) = \boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(\sigma(r))$ (see the tabular interpretation (3) in § 4.4). Hence, any structure $\mathcal{M}$ has the interpretive presentation in Fig. 4 (see the discussion on linearization § 5.2).




**Fig. 4.** Interpreted Structure

In the concept of a FOLE structure we have abstracted the (primary) keys from the tuples that they described. The key-embedding construction replaces keys into their tuples.

**Definition 1.** *(key embedding) Any* FOLE *structure* $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{E}, \sigma, \tau, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ *with signature map* $R \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{List}(X) : r \mapsto \langle I, s \rangle$ *and tuple map* $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y) : k \mapsto \langle I, t \rangle$ *has a companion* key embedding *structure* $\dot{\mathcal{M}} = \langle \mathcal{E}, \dot{\sigma}, \dot{\tau}, \mathcal{E}{+}\mathcal{A} \rangle$ *consisting of entity classification* $\mathcal{E}$*, parallel sum typed domain* $\mathcal{E}{+}\mathcal{A} = \langle R{+}X, K{+}Y, \models_{\mathcal{E}+\mathcal{A}} \rangle$*,* [14] *schema* $\langle R, \dot{\sigma}, R{+}X \rangle$ *with signature map* $R \xrightarrow{\dot{\sigma}} \mathbf{List}(R{+}X) : r \mapsto \langle 1, r \rangle{+}\langle I, s \rangle$*, and universe* $\langle K, \dot{\tau}, K{+}Y \rangle$ *with tuple map* $K \xrightarrow{\dot{\tau}} \mathbf{List}(K{+}Y) : k \mapsto \langle 1, k \rangle{+}\langle I, t \rangle$*. The signature and tuple maps are injective.*

[14] We can think of the entity classification $\mathcal{E} = \langle R, K, \models_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle$ as a type domain. For each sort (attribute type) $r \in R$, the data domain of that type is the $\mathcal{E}$-extent $\mathcal{E}_r = \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) = \{k \in K \mid k \models_{\mathcal{E}} r\}$. The passage $R \xrightarrow{ext_{\mathcal{E}}} \wp K$ maps a sort $r \in R$ to its data domain ($\mathcal{E}$-extent) $\mathcal{E}_r \subseteq K$.

*Structure Morphisms.* In order to allow communities of discourse to interoperate, we define the notion of a morphism between two structures that respects the ERA data model. A structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ (Fig. 5) from source structure $\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \langle \sigma_2, \tau_2 \rangle, \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle$ to target structure $\mathcal{M}_1 = \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \langle \sigma_1, \tau_1 \rangle, \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle$ is defined in terms of the hypergraph and classification morphisms between the source and target structure components (projections):

$$\begin{array}{rrcl}
\textit{typed domain morphism} & \mathcal{A}_2 = \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{A}_1 \\
\textit{entity infomorphism} & \mathcal{E}_2 = \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle r,k\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{E}_1 \\
\textit{schema morphism} & \mathcal{S}_2 = \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle r,f\rangle}{\Longrightarrow} & \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{S}_1 \\
\textit{universe morphism} & \mathcal{U}_2 = \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle k,g\rangle}{\Longleftarrow} & \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{U}_1
\end{array}$$

satisfying the conditions

$$\begin{array}{rc}
\textit{typed domain morphism} & g(y_1) \models_{\mathcal{A}_2} x_2 \ \ \underline{\text{iff}} \ \ y_1 \models_{\mathcal{A}_1} f(x_2) \\
\textit{entity infomorphism} & k(k_1) \models_{\mathcal{E}_2} r_2 \ \ \underline{\text{iff}} \ \ k_1 \models_{\mathcal{E}_1} r(r_2)\,. \\
\textit{schema morphism} & r \cdot \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \cdot \textstyle\sum_f \\
\textit{universe morphism} & k \cdot \tau_2 = \tau_1 \cdot \textstyle\sum_g
\end{array}$$




**Fig. 5.** Structure Morphism

The designation defining condition states that for any $k_1 \in K_1$ and $r_2 \in R_2$,

$$\Big(k(k_1) \models_{\mathcal{E}_2} r_2 \ \underline{\text{iff}}\ k_1 \models_{\mathcal{E}_1} r(r_2)\Big) \ \underline{\text{implies}}$$
$$\Big(\tau_2(k(k_1)) = \textstyle\sum_g(\tau_1(k_1)) \models_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A}_2)} \sigma_2(r_2) \ \underline{\text{iff}}\ \tau_1(k_1) \models_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A}_1)} \textstyle\sum_f(\sigma_2(r_2)) = \sigma_1(r(r_2))\Big).$$

Structure morphisms compose component-wise. Let **Struc** denote the context of structures and structure morphisms. In the appendix § A, we develop **Struc** as a *fibered* mathematical context in two orientations: either as the Grothedieck construction of the schema indexed mathematical context of structures $\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}} \mathbf{Cxt}$ or as the Grothedieck construction of the universe indexed mathematical context of structures $\mathbf{Univ}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}} \mathbf{Cxt}$. The schema indexed mathematical context of structures is used in Kent [10] to establish the institutional aspect of `FOLE`.

Any structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,1_Y \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ with identity value map $Y \xrightarrow{1_Y} Y$ has the interpretive presentation in Fig. 6. [15]




**Fig. 6.** Interpreted Structure Morphism

[15] Any infomorphism $\mathcal{A}_2 \overset{\langle f,g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{A}_1$ has the equivalent condition $f \cdot \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}_1} = \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}_2} \cdot g^{-1}$.

**Definition 2.** *(key embedding) Any structure morphism* $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ *has a companion key embedding structure morphism*

$$\dot{\mathcal{M}}_2 = \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \dot{\sigma}_2, \dot{\tau}_2, \mathcal{E}_2{+}\mathcal{A}_2\rangle \overset{\langle r,k,f,f+g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \dot{\sigma}_1, \dot{\tau}_1, \mathcal{E}_1{+}\mathcal{A}_1\rangle = \dot{\mathcal{M}}_1.$$

*with the following components:*

| | |
|---|---|
| typed domain morphism | $\mathcal{E}_2{+}\mathcal{A}_2 \overset{\langle r+f,k+g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{E}_1{+}\mathcal{A}_1$ |
| entity infomorphism | $\mathcal{E}_2 \overset{\langle r,k\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{E}_1$ |
| schema morphism | $\dot{\mathcal{S}}_2 = \langle R_2, \dot{\sigma}_2, R_2{+}X_2\rangle \overset{\langle r,r+f\rangle}{\rightrightarrows} \langle R_1, \dot{\sigma}_1, R_1{+}X_1\rangle = \mathcal{S}_1$ |
| universe morphism | $\mathcal{U}_2 = \langle K_2, \dot{\tau}_2, K_2{+}Y_2\rangle \overset{\langle k,k+g\rangle}{\leftrightarrows} \langle K_1, \dot{\tau}_1, K_1{+}Y_1\rangle = \mathcal{U}_1$ |

*Proof.* The following conditions must hold.

| | |
|---|---|
| *typed domain morphism* | $g(y_1) \overset{k(k_1)}{\models_{\mathcal{E}_2+\mathcal{A}_2}} x_2 \overset{r_2}{\;\underline{\text{iff}}\;} y_1 \overset{k_1}{\models_{\mathcal{E}_1+\mathcal{A}_1}} f(x_2)\big)\overset{r(r_1)}{}$ |
| *entity infomorphism* | $k(k_1) \models_{\mathcal{E}_2} r_2 \;\underline{\text{iff}}\; k_1 \models_{\mathcal{E}_1} r(r_2)\,.$ |
| *schema morphism* | $r \cdot \dot{\sigma}_1 \;=\; \dot{\sigma}_2 \cdot \sum_{r+f}$ |
| *universe morphism* | $k \cdot \dot{\tau}_2 \;=\; \dot{\tau}_1 \cdot \sum_{k+g}$ |

We use the comparable conditions for the original structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$. The entity infomorphism condition is given. The type domain morphism condition is straightforward. We show the schema morphism condition. The universe morphism condition is similar. The schema morphism condition for the original structure morphism is $r \cdot \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \cdot \sum_f$; that is, for any $r_2 \in R_2$, if $\sigma_2(r_2) = \langle I_2, s_2\rangle$ and $\sigma_1(r(r_2)) = \langle I_1, s_1\rangle$, then $\langle I_1, s_1\rangle = \sum_f(I_2, s_2)$. Hence, the schema morphism condition for the key-embedding structure morphism holds, since $\dot{\sigma}_1(r(r_2)) \;=\; \langle 1, r(r_2)\rangle{+}\langle I_1, s_1\rangle \;=\; \sum_r(1, r_2){+}\sum_f(I_2, s_2)$
$\;=\; \sum_{r+f}\big(\langle 1, r_2\rangle{+}\langle I_2, s_2\rangle\big) \;=\; \sum_{r+f}(\dot{\sigma}_2(r_2))$ ■

*Integrity Constraints.* Integrity constraints help preserve the validity and consistency of data. Here we briefly explain how various integrity constraints are represented in the ERA data model of FOLE.

**Entity:** (primary key rule) Entity integrity states that every table must have a primary key and that the column or columns chosen to be the primary key should be unique and not null. In the ERA data model of FOLE, entity integrity asserts that the universe $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y\rangle$ of a structure $\mathcal{M}$ is well-defined.

**Domain:** Domain integrity specifies that all columns in a relational database must be declared upon a defined domain. In the ERA data model of FOLE, domain integrity asserts that the schema $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X\rangle$ and the list designation $\langle \sigma, \tau\rangle : \mathcal{E} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})$ of a structure $\mathcal{M}$ are well-defined.

**Referential:** (foreign key rule) Referential integrity states that the foreign-key value of a source table refers to a primary key value of a target table. In the ERA data model of FOLE, referential integrity asserts that the ERA data model of FOLE is a mixed data model.

*Algebra.* For simplicity of presentation, this paper and the paper on FOLE superstructure (Kent [9]) use a simplified form of FOLE, in contrast to the full form presented in Kent [8]. In this paper and Kent [9], schemas are used in place of (many-sorted) first-order logical languages. Schemas are simplified logical languages without function symbols. The main practical result is that signature morphisms $\langle I', s' \rangle \xrightarrow{h} \langle I, s \rangle$ are replaced by term vectors $\langle I', s' \rangle \xrightarrow{t} \langle I, s \rangle$ in the full version of FOLE. Signature morphisms are simplified term vectors without function symbols. In the full version of FOLE, equations can be defined between parallel pairs of term vectors $\langle I', s' \rangle \xrightarrow{t,t'} \langle I, s \rangle$, thus allowing the use of equational presentations and their congruences. [16] Also in the full version of FOLE, the tuple map along signature morphisms becomes the algebraic operation along term vectors; hence, formula flow (substitution/quantification) in Kent [9] is lifted from being along signature morphisms to being along term vectors. [17]




**Fig. 7.** FOLE Foundation

[16] The tuple relational calculus is a query language for relational databases. In order to use the tuple calculus in the FOLE, we need to enrich with many-sorted constant declarations and equational presentations. Constant declarations are first-order logical languages with sorted nullary function symbols. A constant $c$ of sort $x$ is an $x$-sorted nullary function symbol $x \xrightarrow{c} \langle \emptyset, 0_X \rangle$.

[17] Let FOLE-ARCH denote Fig. 1. in Kent [8]. FOLE-ARCH is the 3-dimensional visualization of the fibered architecture of FOLE. The upper right quadrant of Fig. 7 corresponds to the the 2-D prism below **Rel** in FOLE-ARCH. As indicated in FOLE-ARCH, to move from the simple version of the FOLE foundation used here (Fig. 7) to the full version in FOLE-ARCH, we lift from sort sets to algebraic languages and from typed domains to many-sorted algebras.

### 4.4 Interpretation.

In the model theory for traditional many-sorted first-order logic, a (possible world, model) structure corresponds to an interpretation of relation symbols (entity types) in terms of relations in a typed domain. The FOLE approach to logic replaces $n$-tuples with lists, defines quantification/substitution along signature morphisms (Kent [9]) (or term vectors in the full version [8]), and following databases, incorporates identifiers (keys) for data value lists (tuples) (here and in Kent [10]). The FOLE approach modifies the idea of model-theoretic interpretation as follows. [18]

We assume that the traditional many-sorted first-order logic language is represented by the schema $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X \rangle$ and that the typed domain is represented by the attribute classification $\mathcal{A} = \langle X, Y, \models_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$. We further assume that these are components of a structure $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{E}, \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle, \mathcal{A} \rangle$.

**Traditional:** In the traditional approach, an entity type $r \in R$ is interpreted as the set of descriptors of entities in the extent of $r$. For $X$-signature $\sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle \in \mathbf{List}(X)$, this is the subset of $Y$-tuples $\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(r) = \wp\tau(\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r)) \in \wp\boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s) = \wp\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}(I, s)$, an element of the fiber relational order $\langle \mathbf{Rel}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s), \subseteq \rangle$. [19] This defines the traditional interpretation function

$$R \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}} \mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{A})\,. \tag{1}$$

For all $r \in R$, we have the relationships

$$\wp\tau(\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r)) = \boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(r) \qquad \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) \subseteq \tau^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(r))\,. \tag{2}$$

**Definition 3.** *The inequality* $\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) \subseteq \tau^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(r))$ *says that* $\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r)$ *is not the morphic closure of itself w.r.t. the tuple map* $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y)$*. A structure* $\mathcal{M}$ *is called* extensive *when the right hand expression in (2) is an equality:* $\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) = \tau^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(r))$ *for any entity type* $r \in R$*.* [20]

Any structure $\mathcal{M}$ with an injective tuple map $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y)$ has an associated extensive structure. An example is the key-embedding structure $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$.

---

[18] Hence, the notions of (1) a many-sorted first-order logic interpretation, (2) a FOLE structure, and (3) an ERA data model are all equivalent; and each can be implemented as a relational database with associated logic (for more on this, see Kent [10]).

[19] The fibered context $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{A})$ is defined in the paper on FOLE interpretation (Kent [10]). An object of $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{A})$, called an $\mathcal{A}$-relation, is a pair $\langle I, s, R \rangle$ consisting of an indexing $X$-signature $\langle I, s \rangle$ and a subset of $\mathcal{A}$-tuples $R \in \wp\boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s) = \wp\boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}(I, s)$.

[20] Philosophical note: In the knowledge resources for a community, the entities are of first importance. The tuples in $\mathbf{List}(Y)$ are descriptors, which may or may not have an identity. An entity consists of an identifier $k \in K$ and its descriptor $\tau(k) \in \wp\tau(K)$. Tuples with identity are those in $\wp\tau(K) \subseteq \mathbf{List}(Y)$. Two entities that have the same descriptor are said to be "descriptor-equivalent".

**Tabular:** In the database approach, an entity type $r \in R$ is interpreted as a table with the entities (both the keys and their descriptors) being explicit. For $X$-signature $\sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle \in \mathbf{List}(X)$, this is the $\langle I, s \rangle$-indexed $\mathcal{A}$-table

$$K(r) \xrightarrow{\tau_r} \boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s)$$
$$\tau_r(k) = \langle I, t \rangle,\ I \xrightarrow{t} Y$$




$\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathcal{M}}(r) = \langle K(r), \tau_r \rangle$ (visualized above) consisting of the key set $K(r) = \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(r) \in \wp K$ and the (descriptor) tuple function $K(r) \xrightarrow{\tau_r} \boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s)$, a restriction of the tuple function $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y)$ for the universe $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle$. The tuple function factors through the traditional interpretation $\tau_r : K(r) \to \boldsymbol{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(r) \hookrightarrow \boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s)$. This defines the tabular interpretation function

$$R \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{T}_{\mathcal{M}}} \mathbf{Tbl}(\mathcal{A})\,.\ ^{21} \tag{3}$$

The companion key-embedding structure $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$ (Def. 1) is most easily understood from its interpretation tables (visualized below).

$$K(r) \xrightarrow{\dot{\tau}_r} \boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{E}+\mathcal{A}}(1{+}I, r{+}s)$$
$$\dot{\tau}_r(k) = \langle 1{+}I, k{+}t \rangle,\ 1 \xrightarrow{k} K,\ I \xrightarrow{t} Y$$




[21] The fibered context $\mathbf{Tbl}(\mathcal{A})$ is defined in the paper on FOLE interpretation (Kent [10]). An object of $\mathbf{Tbl}(\mathcal{A})$, which is called an $\mathcal{A}$-table, is a triple $\langle I, s, K, t \rangle$ consisting of an $X$-signature $\langle I, s \rangle$, a set of entities (keys) $K$, and a tuple function $K \xrightarrow{t} \boldsymbol{tup}_{\mathcal{A}}(I, s)$ mapping each entity in $K$ to its descriptor $\mathcal{A}$-tuple.

# 5 Connections

## 5.1 Analogy.

In the original paper (Kent [8]) explaining the first-order logical environment FOLE, there was an analogy between the top-level ontological categories discussed in (Sowa [11]) and the components of the first-order logical environment FOLE. We recast that here in terms of the FOLE approach to the ERA data model. The analogy between the Sowa hierarchy and FOLE is illustrated graphically in Fig. 8. The twelve categories displayed in the hierarchy (we do not concern ourselves here with the temporal dimension given by the *continuent-occurent* distinction) and the primitives from which they are generated are arranged in the matrix of Tbl. 2 with the corresponding FOLE terminology in parentheses.

The *physical-abstract* distinction, which corresponds to the Heraclitus distinction *physis-logos*, is represented by the FOLE classification dimension, a connection between FOLE schemas and FOLE universes. The *abstract* category corresponds to FOLE types, either entities or attributes. The *physical* category corresponds to FOLE instances, either entities or attributes. The *independent-relative-mediating* triad is represented by the FOLE hypergraph dimension, a connection between FOLE entities and FOLE attributes. The *independent* category (firstness) corresponds to FOLE entities that are not attributes. The *relative* category (secondness) corresponds to FOLE attributes that are not entities. The *mediating* category (thirdness) corresponds to FOLE list maps between entities and attributes. The triads *actuality-prehension-nexus* and *form-proposition-intention* correspond to Whitehead's categories of existence.




hierarchy of top-level categories

FOLE structure components

**Fig. 8.** Analogy

Here we explain this in more detail. As discussed in § 4.3, a FOLE structure is a two-dimensional combination of a classification and a hypergraph. The entire hierarchy of the top-level ontological categories is represented by

| | *independent (entity classification)* | *mediating (list designation)* | *relative (type domain)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *abstract (schema)* | *form (entity type)* | *intension (signature)* | *proposition (sort)* |
| *physical (universe)* | *actuality (entity)* | *nexus (tuple)* | *prehension (value)* |

**Table 2.** Matrix of six central categories

a FOLE (model-theoretic) structure $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{E}, \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle, \mathcal{A} \rangle$. This is appropriate, since a (model-theoretic) structure represents the knowledge in the local world of a community of discourse. The *form-proposition-intention* triad is represented by a FOLE schema $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X \rangle$ with signature function $R \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbf{List}(X)$. The *actuality-prehension-nexus* triad is represented by a FOLE universe $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle$ with tuple function $K \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{List}(Y)$. The firstness subgraph of *independent*(*actuality*,*form*) is represented by a FOLE entity classification $\mathcal{E} = \langle R, K, \models_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle$ between entity instances (keys) and entity types (or a classification between keys and logical formula, more generally; see Kent [9]). The secondness subgraph of *relative*(*prehension*,*proposition*) is represented by a FOLE attribute classification $\mathcal{A} = \langle X, Y, \models_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ between attribute instances (data values) and attribute types (sorts). The thirdness subgraph of *mediating*(*nexus*,*intention*) is represented by a FOLE list designation $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle : \mathcal{E} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})$. A FOLE entity type loosely corresponds to a *form* = *independent* $\wedge$ *abstract*. A FOLE entity (key) loosely corresponds to an *actuality* = *independent* $\wedge$ *physical*. A FOLE sort (attribute type), which is not necessariy linked from a FOLE entity, loosely corresponds to a *proposition* = *relative* $\wedge$ *abstract*. A FOLE data value (attribute instance) loosely corresponds to a *prehension* = *relative* $\wedge$ *physical*.

### 5.2 Linearization.

The "ontology log" Olog formalism (Spivak and Kent [12]) is a category-theoretic model for knowledge representation. As we indicate below, there is a sense in which the FOLE representation subsumes the Olog representation (and vice-versa). [22] Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a FOLE structure with schema $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X \rangle$, universe $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle$, type domain $\mathcal{A} = \langle X, Y, \models_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$, entity classification $\mathcal{E} = \langle R, K, \models_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle$, and list designation $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle : \mathcal{E} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})$.

[22] This section is closely related to the discussion of the sketch and interpretation associated with a unified relational database in § 4 of Kent [7]. FOLE structures are adjointly related to relational databases, as shown in the paper on FOLE interpretation (Kent [10]).

By using the extent operator (§ 4.3), the following classifications and sets are informationally equivalent.

| *classification* | *set* | |
|---|---|---|
| $\mathcal{E}$ | $\coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}$ | $= \{(r,k) \mid r \in R, k \in K, k \models_{\mathcal{E}} r\}$ |
| $\mathcal{A}$ | $\coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}}$ | $= \{(x,y) \mid x \in X, y \in Y, y \models_{\mathcal{A}} x\}$ |
| $\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})$ | $\coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}$ | $= \{(I,s,t) \mid (I,s) \in \mathbf{List}(X), (I,t) \in \mathbf{List}(Y), (I,t) \models_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})} (I,s)\}$ |

The designation property defines a function $\coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}} \xrightarrow{\coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\langle\sigma,\tau\rangle}} \coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})}$, which is the sum of the extent diagram morphism $\boldsymbol{ext}_{\langle\sigma,\tau\rangle} = \langle \sigma, \tau_{\llcorner} \rangle : \langle R, \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{E}} \rangle \to \langle \mathbf{List}(X), \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A})} \rangle$ (Fig. 4 of § 4.3). By flattening the resulting lists, for each $(r,k) \in \coprod \mathbf{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}$, we know that $(s_i, t_i) \in \coprod \boldsymbol{ext}_{\mathcal{A}}$ for each index $i \in \alpha(r) = I$ in the common arity. Hence, the following linearization set [23] is equivalent in information to the structure $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\boldsymbol{lin}(\mathcal{M}) = \Big\{ \langle \underbrace{(r,k)}_{\text{ent}}, \underbrace{i, (s_i, t_i)}_{\text{attr}} \rangle \mid (r,k) \in \coprod \mathbf{ext}_{\mathcal{E}}, \sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle, \tau(k) = \langle I, t \rangle, i \in I \Big\}.$$

The FOLE representation is binary, since it has two kinds of type, sorts (attribute types) and entity types. The Olog representation is unary, since it has only one kind of type, the abstract concept. [24] However, the FOLE representation can be transformed to the Olog representation by the process of *linearization*. If we restrict FOLE to the unified model, identifying entities with attributes $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A}$, by separating the type/instance information in the linearization set $\boldsymbol{lin}(\mathcal{M})$ via the extent operator along the classification dimension (Fig. 1), we get the basis for the Olog data model, consisting of three notions: types, aspects, and facts. Types, which represent things, are depicted by nodes in Olog; aspects, which represent functional relationships between things, are depicted by edges in Olog; and facts, which represent assertions, are depicted by path equations in Olog.

Olog types and aspects are covered by the linearization process discussed here. Olog facts correspond to the formalism discussed (indirectly) in the FOLE superstructure (Kent [9]) and (more directly) in the full form of FOLE (Kent [8]).

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} r \\ {\scriptstyle \text{typ}} \end{array} \xrightarrow{(r,i)} \begin{array}{c} s_i \\ {\scriptstyle \text{typ}} \end{array} \right\} \ \mathbf{S} \quad \text{a schema context}$$

$$\Big\downarrow \boldsymbol{ext} \qquad\qquad \Big\downarrow \boldsymbol{M} \quad \text{an interpretation passage}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \boldsymbol{M}(r) \\ {\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{ext}(r)} \end{array} \xrightarrow[\tau_r \cdot \boldsymbol{tup}(\pi_i)]{M(i)} \begin{array}{c} \boldsymbol{M}(s_i) \\ {\scriptstyle \boldsymbol{ext}(s_i)} \end{array} \right\} \ \mathbf{Set} \quad \text{the context of sets}$$

$$k \longmapsto t_i$$

[23] The linearization set $\boldsymbol{lin}(\mathcal{M})$ loosely corresponds to the following: (1) the table used in the entity-attribute-value (EAV) data model, where data is recorded in three columns: the entity component is a foreign key into an object information table, the attribute component is a foreign key into an attribute definition table, and the value component is the value of the attribute; and (2) the labelled directed graph used in the resource description framework (RDF) data model, where each subject-predicate-object triple is regarded as an edge in the graph.

[24] See § 4.4 of [12] for further discussion of binary/unary knowledge representations.

`Olog` **Database Schema S:** By projecting the type components out of the linearization set $\boldsymbol{lin}(\mathcal{M})$, define a graph $\mathcal{G}$ whose node set is $R = X$ and whose edge set is $\coprod_{r \in R=X} \alpha(r)$. Picture the graph $\mathcal{G}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ r \xrightarrow{(r,i)} s_i \;\middle|\; \sigma(r) = \langle I, s \rangle,\ i \in I,\ \text{with } r, s_i \in R = X \right\} .$$

The schema mathematical context $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{G}^*$ is the path context of graph $\mathcal{G}$. The graph $\mathcal{G}$ corresponds to a many-sorted unary algebraic language $\mathcal{O} = \langle X, \Omega \rangle$, where $\Omega$ is essentially the opposite of $\mathcal{G}$: the collection of sets of function (operator) symbols $\Omega = \{ \Omega_{s_i, \langle 1, r \rangle} \mid \text{sort } s_i \in X, \text{unary signature } \langle 1, r \rangle \in \mathbf{List}(X) \}$ with each $(r, i) \in \Omega_{s_i, \langle 1, r \rangle}$ being an $s_i$-sorted $r = \langle 1, r \rangle$-ary function symbol $s_i \xrightarrow{(r,i)} r = \langle 1, r \rangle$. [25] The opposite of the schema context is a subcontext (no cotupling) of the term context $\mathbf{Term}_{\mathcal{O}} \xleftarrow{\boldsymbol{inc}} \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{op}}$. An `Olog` fact corresponds to a linear $\mathcal{O}$-equation $(t = \hat{t}) : \langle 1, s \rangle \multimap \langle 1, s' \rangle$.

`Olog` **Database Instance $\boldsymbol{M}$:** Using extent, define a passage $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{G}^* \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{M}} \mathbf{Set}$ which maps a node $r$ in $\mathbf{S}$ to the extent $\boldsymbol{M}(r) = K(r) = \boldsymbol{ext}(r)$ and maps an edge $r \xrightarrow{(r,i)} s_i$ in $\mathbf{S}$ to the function $\boldsymbol{M}(r) \xrightarrow[\tau_r \cdot \boldsymbol{tup}(\pi_i)]{\boldsymbol{M}(r,i)} \boldsymbol{M}(s_i)$. [26] The functional language $\mathcal{O} = \langle X, \Omega \rangle$ mentioned above has an $\mathcal{O}$-algebra $\langle A, \delta \rangle$ consisting of the $X$-sorted collection of extents $\{ A_x = \boldsymbol{ext}(x) \subseteq Y \mid x \in X \}$, where $\delta$ assigns the $\langle 1, r \rangle$-ary $s_i$-sorted function $\boldsymbol{M}(r) = A_r = A^{\langle 1, r \rangle} \xrightarrow[\boldsymbol{M}(r,i)]{\delta_{(r,i)}} A_{s_i} = \boldsymbol{M}(s_i)$ to each function symbol $s_i \xrightarrow{(r,i)} r = \langle 1, r \rangle$. [27] The interpretation passage $\mathbf{Term}_{\mathcal{O}}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{A}} \mathbf{Set}$ inductively define by this $\mathcal{O}$-algebra contains the database instance as a subfunctor $\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{inc}^{\mathrm{op}} \circ \boldsymbol{A}$. Any equation satisfied by the `Olog` database interpretation $\boldsymbol{M}$ is also satisfied by the interpretation passage $\boldsymbol{A}$. [28]

---

[25] Define $\langle X, \Omega \rangle$-term $\langle I, s \rangle \xrightarrow{r} \langle 1, r \rangle = r$ as the cotupling of $\{ s_i \xrightarrow{(r,i)} r = \langle 1, r \rangle \mid i \in I \}$, so that $s_i \xrightarrow{(r,i)} r = \langle 1, r \rangle$ is the composite $s_i \xrightarrow{\pi_i} \langle I, s \rangle \xrightarrow{r} \langle 1, r \rangle = r$.

[26] A projection $\boldsymbol{M}(r) = \boldsymbol{ext}(r) \xrightarrow{\tau_r} \boldsymbol{tup}(I, s) \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{tup}(\pi_i)} \boldsymbol{tup}(1, s_i) = \boldsymbol{ext}(s_i) = \boldsymbol{M}(s_i)$ of the tabular interpretation in § 4.4.

[27] $\delta$ assigns the table $\boldsymbol{M}(r) = \boldsymbol{ext}(r) \underset{\tau_r}{\xrightarrow{\delta_r}} \boldsymbol{tup}(I, s) = \prod_{i \in I} A_{s_i} = \prod_{i \in I} \boldsymbol{M}(s_i)$ (a tupling) to the cotupling $\langle I, s \rangle \xrightarrow{r} r$.

[28] The interpretation passage satisfies an $\mathcal{O}$-equation $(t = \hat{t}) : \langle I, s \rangle \multimap \langle I', s' \rangle$ when the operations coincide $\boldsymbol{A}(t) = \boldsymbol{A}(\hat{t}) : \boldsymbol{A}(I, s) \leftarrow \boldsymbol{A}(I', s')$ in $\mathbf{Set}$ (see Kent [8]).

## 6 Conclusion

The ERA data model describes the conceptual model for a community of discourse, which can be used as the foundation for designing relational databases. The first-order logical environment FOLE provides a rigorous and principled approach to distributed inter-operable first-order information systems, which integrates ontologies and databases into a unified framework. In this paper, we have discussed in detail the representation of elements of the ERA data model with components of the FOLE logical environment, described interpretation basics, and illustrated the connections between FOLE and other data models in knowledge representation. In the near future, we will complete the presentation of the FOLE logical environment by discussing the formalism and semantics of many-sorted logic in the paper Kent [9] and database interpretation in the paper Kent [10]. After this, two papers are pending on the integration of federated systems of knowledge, either over a fixed type domain or over a fixed universe.

## A The Fibered Context of Structures.

In order to allow communities of discourse to interoperate, we define the notion of a morphism between two structures that respects the ERA data model. This describes the mathematical context of structures **Struc** as a *fibered* mathematical context in two orientations: the Grothedieck construction of the schema indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}} \mathbf{Cxt}$ or the Grothedieck construction of the universe indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Univ}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}} \mathbf{Cxt}$. The schema indexed mathematical context of structures is used in the paper [9] on FOLE superstructure to establish the institutional aspect of the FOLE. Each orientation is developed in three steps: the structure fiber context for a single indexing object, the structure fiber passage along an indexing morphism, the fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms as the Grothedieck construction for this orientation. This dual development of the mathematical context of structures **Struc** (Prop. 2) is based upon and mirrors a dual development of the mathematical context of classifications **Cls** (Prop. 1).

### A.1 An Exemplar.

The mathematical context of classifications **Cls** is a *fibered* mathematical context in two orientations: the Grothedieck construction of the type set indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}} \mathbf{Cxt}$ or the Grothedieck construction of the instance set indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}} \mathbf{Cxt}$.

**Proposition 1.** *Any infomorphism* $\mathcal{C}_2 = \langle X_2, Y_2, \models_2 \rangle \overset{\langle f,g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \langle X_1, Y_1, \models_1 \rangle = \mathcal{C}_1$ *in the mathematical context of classifications* **Cls**, *with type function projection* $X_2 \xrightarrow{f} X_1$ *and instance function projection* $Y_2 \xleftarrow{g} Y_1$, *has dual factorizations*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \overbrace{\qquad\qquad\qquad}^{\mathbf{Cls}(X_2)} & \\ \mathcal{C}_2 & \underset{\langle 1_{X_2},\, g\rangle}{\overset{g}{\rightleftharpoons}} & \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f(\mathcal{C}_1) = \langle X_2, Y_1, \models_f \rangle \\ g \uparrow \downarrow \langle 1_{X_2},\, g\rangle & & f \uparrow \downarrow \langle f,\, 1_{Y_1}\rangle \\ \langle X_2, Y_1, \models_g \rangle = \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g(\mathcal{C}_2) & \underset{\langle f,\, 1_{Y_1}\rangle}{\overset{f}{\rightleftharpoons}} & \mathcal{C}_1 \\ & \underbrace{\qquad\qquad\qquad}_{\mathbf{Cls}(Y_1)} & \end{array}$$

*where* $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f(\mathcal{C}_1) = f^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_1) = \langle X_2, Y_1, \models_f \rangle = \langle X_2, Y_1, \models_g \rangle = g^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_2) = \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g(\mathcal{C}_2)$.

*Proof.* $y_1 \models_g x_2$ $\underline{\text{iff}}$ $g(y_1) \models_{\mathcal{C}_2} x_2$ $\underline{\text{iff}}$ $y_1 \models_{\mathcal{C}_1} f(x_2)$ $\underline{\text{iff}}$ $y_1 \models_f x_2$.

The top-right factorization consists of a $\mathbf{Cls}(X_2)$-morphism $\mathcal{C}_2 \underset{\langle 1_{X_2}, g\rangle}{\overset{g}{\rightleftharpoons}} \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f(\mathcal{C}_1)$ and the $\mathcal{C}_1^{\text{th}}$ component $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f(\mathcal{C}_1) \underset{\langle f, 1_{Y_1}\rangle}{\overset{f}{\rightleftharpoons}} \mathcal{C}_1$ of a bridge $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f \circ \boldsymbol{inc}_{X_2} \overset{\grave{\chi}_f}{\Longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{inc}_{X_1}$. This factors through the $X_2$-classification $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f(\mathcal{C}_1)$, which is the fiber passage image along the type function $X_2 \xrightarrow{f} X_1$ of the the $X_1$-classification $\mathcal{C}_1$. The left-bottom factorization consists of the $\mathcal{C}_2^{\text{th}}$ component $\mathcal{C}_2 \underset{\langle 1_{X_2}, g\rangle}{\overset{g}{\rightleftharpoons}} \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g(\mathcal{C}_2)$ of a bridge $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g \circ \boldsymbol{inc}_{Y_1} \overset{\acute{\chi}_g}{\Longleftarrow} \boldsymbol{inc}_{Y_2}$ and a $\mathbf{Cls}(Y_1)$-morphism $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g(\mathcal{C}_2) \underset{\langle f, 1_{Y_1}\rangle}{\overset{f}{\rightleftharpoons}} \mathcal{C}_1$. This factors through the $Y_1$-classification $\boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g(\mathcal{C}_2)$, which is the fiber passage image along the instance function $Y_2 \xleftarrow{g} Y_1$ of the the $Y_2$-classification $\mathcal{C}_2$.

### A.2 Schema Orientation.

The fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms can be developed as the Grothedieck construction of a schema indexed mathematical context. This approach using schema indexing corresponds to the use of type-set indexing in § A.1, and was the approach used in the paper (Kent [8]).

1. For a fixed schema $\mathcal{S}$, we define the structure fiber context $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S})$.
2. For a schema morphism $\mathcal{S}_2 \overset{\langle r,f \rangle}{\Longrightarrow} \mathcal{S}_1$, we define the structure fiber passage $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_2) \xleftarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}} \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_1)$.
3. We define the fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms to be the Grothedieck construction of the schema indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}} \mathbf{Cxt}$.

*Fixed Schema.* Let $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X \rangle \in \mathbf{Sch}$ be a fixed schema. We define the notion of a morphism between two (fixed schema) $\mathcal{S}$-structures that respects the ERA data model. In these morphisms, the schema remains fixed, but the attribute and entity instances (data values and keys) are formally linked by maps that respect universe tuple, typed domain extent and entity interpretation. An $\mathcal{S}$-structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\Longleftarrow} \mathcal{M}_1$ over a fixed schema $\mathcal{S} = \langle R, \sigma, X \rangle$ is a universe morphism $\boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\Longleftarrow} \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_1)$, where $\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle 1_X,g \rangle}{\Longleftarrow} \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ is an infomorphism in $\mathbf{Cls}(X)$ over the sort set $X$, and $\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle 1_R,k \rangle}{\Longleftarrow} \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ is an infomorphism in $\mathbf{Cls}(R)$ over the entity type set $R$. [29] $\mathcal{S}$-structure morphisms compose component-wise. Let $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S})$ denote the fiber context of structures over the fixed schema $\mathcal{S}$.

*Structure Fiber Passage.* We define the indexed context $\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}} \mathbf{Cxt}$. Given a schema $\mathcal{S}$, there is a fiber context of structures $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S})$ with that schema. Given a schema morphism $\mathcal{S}_2 \overset{\langle r,f \rangle}{\Longrightarrow} \mathcal{S}_1$, there is a fiber passage of structures $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_2) \xleftarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}} \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_1)$: a structure $\mathcal{M}_1 = \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \langle \sigma_1, \tau_1 \rangle, \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle \in \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_1)$ is mapped to a structure $\mathcal{M}_2 = \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \langle r^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1), \langle \sigma_2, \tau_1 \rangle, f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_1) \rangle \in \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. $\mathcal{M}_2$ is called the reduct of $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_1$ is called the expansion of $\mathcal{M}_2$. The two are linked $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1) \overset{\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{M}_1}}{\underset{\langle r,f \rangle}{\Longleftarrow}} \mathcal{M}_1$ by a structure morphism, which is the $\mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{th}}$ component of a bridge $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle} \circ \boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{S}_2} \overset{\hat{\chi}_{\langle r,f \rangle}}{\Longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{S}_1}$.

[29] Hence, the target type domain is the inverse image of the source type domain $\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1) = g^{-1}(\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2)) = \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_g(\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2))$ and the target entity classification is the inverse image of the source entity classification $\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1) = k^{-1}(\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2)) = \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlyvee}_k(\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2))$. By combining entity/attribute inverse image classifications, the target structure $\mathcal{M}_1$ is the inverse image $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) = \langle k^{-1}(\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2)), \langle \sigma, \tau_1 \rangle, g^{-1}(\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2)) \rangle$ of the source structure $\mathcal{M}_2$ (§ A.3). The two are bridged $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\Longleftarrow} \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) = \mathcal{M}_1$ by the structure morphism.




*Multiple Universes.* The Grothedieck construction of the schema indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}} \mathbf{Cxt}$ is the fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms. A structure $\mathcal{M}$ is as described in § 4.3 (Fig. 3). A structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ from source structure $\mathcal{M}_2$ to target structure $\mathcal{M}_1$ consists of a schema morphism $\mathcal{S}_2 \overset{\langle r,f\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{S}_1$ from source schema $\mathcal{S}_2$ to target structure $\mathcal{S}_1$ and a morphism

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \langle \sigma_2, \tau_2\rangle, \mathcal{A}_2\rangle \overset{\langle k,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \langle r^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1), \langle \sigma_2, \tau_1\rangle, f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_1)\rangle = \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f\rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1)$$

in the fiber mathematical context of structures $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. Hence, a structure morphism satisfies the following conditions.

list preservation
$$r \cdot \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \cdot \textstyle\sum_f$$
$$k \cdot \tau_2 = \tau_1 \cdot \textstyle\sum_g$$
infomorphisms
$$k_1 \models_{\mathcal{E}_1} r(r_2) \quad \underline{\text{iff}} \quad k(k_1) \models_{\mathcal{E}_2} r_2$$
$$y_1 \models_{\mathcal{A}_1} f(x_2) \quad \underline{\text{iff}} \quad g(y_1) \models_{\mathcal{A}_2} x_2$$

Thus, a structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ (Fig. 5 in § 4.3) from source structure $\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \langle \sigma_2, \tau_2\rangle, \mathcal{A}_2\rangle$ to target structure $\mathcal{M}_1 = \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \langle \sigma_1, \tau_1\rangle, \mathcal{A}_1\rangle$ is defined in terms of the hypergraph and classification morphisms between the source and target structure components (projections):

$$\textit{universe morphism} \quad \mathcal{U}_2 = \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle k,g\rangle}{\Longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{U}_1$$
$$\textit{schema morphism} \quad \mathcal{S}_2 = \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle r,f\rangle}{\Longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{S}_1$$
$$\textit{typed domain morphism} \quad \mathcal{A}_2 = \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{A}_1$$
$$\textit{entity infomorphism} \quad \mathcal{E}_2 = \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle r,k\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{E}_1$$

Structure morphisms compose component-wise. Let **Struc** denote the context of structures and structure morphisms. (Fig. 7 in § 4.3)

### A.3 Universe Orientation.

As evident from the type-instance duality in Fig. 3 and Fig. 5 of § 4, the fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms can be developed from the dual standpoint — the Grothedieck construction of a universe indexed mathematical context. This approach using universe indexing corresponds to the use of instance-set indexing in § A.1.

1. For a fixed universe $\mathcal{U}$, we define the structure fiber context $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U})$.
2. For a universe morphism $\mathcal{U}_2 \xleftarrow{\langle k,g \rangle} \mathcal{U}_1$, we define the structure fiber passage $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_2) \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}} \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_1)$.
3. We define the fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms to be the Grothedieck construction of the universe indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Univ}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}} \mathbf{Cxt}$

*Fixed Universe.* Let $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle \in \mathbf{Univ}$ be a fixed universe. We define the notion of a morphism between two (fixed universe) $\mathcal{U}$-structures that respects the ERA data model. In these morphisms, the universe remains fixed, but the attribute types (sorts) and entity types are formally linked by maps that respect schema signature, typed domain extent and entity interpretation. A $\mathcal{U}$-structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \xrightleftharpoons{\langle r,f \rangle} \mathcal{M}_1$ over a fixed universe $\mathcal{U} = \langle K, \tau, Y \rangle$ is a schema morphism $\boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_2) \xrightleftharpoons{\langle r,f \rangle} \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_1)$, where $\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2) \xrightleftharpoons{\langle f,1_Y \rangle} \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ is an infomorphism in $\mathbf{Cls}(Y)$ over the value set $Y$, and $\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2) \xrightleftharpoons{\langle r,1_K \rangle} \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ is an infomorphism in $\mathbf{Cls}(K)$ over the key set $K$. [30] Here, $\mathcal{M}_2$ is called the reduct of $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_1$ is called the expansion of $\mathcal{M}_2$. The two are bridged $\mathcal{M}_2 = \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1) \xrightleftharpoons{\langle r,f \rangle} \mathcal{M}_1$ by the structure morphism. [31] $\mathcal{U}$-structure morphisms compose component-wise. Let $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U})$ denote the fiber context of structures over the fixed universe $\mathcal{U}$.

*Structure Fiber Passage.* We define the indexed context $\mathbf{Univ}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}} \mathbf{Cxt}$. Given a universe $\mathcal{U}$, there is a fiber context of structures $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U})$ with that universe. Given a universe morphism $\mathcal{U}_2 \xleftarrow{\langle k,g \rangle} \mathcal{U}_1$, there is a fiber passage of structures $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_2) \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}} \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_1)$: a structure $\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \langle \sigma_2, \tau_2 \rangle, \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle \in$

[30] Hence, the source type domain is the inverse image of the target type domain $\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2) = f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1)) = \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_f(\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1))$ and the source entity classification is the inverse image of the target entity classification $\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2) = r^{-1}(\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1)) = \boldsymbol{cls}^{\curlywedge}_r(\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1))$. By combining entity/attribute inverse image classifications, the source structure $\mathcal{M}_2$ is the inverse image $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \langle r^{-1}(\boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1)), \langle \sigma_2, \tau \rangle, f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1)) \rangle$ of the target structure $\mathcal{M}_1$ (§ A.2).

[31] When this definition is extended to formulas, one gets the notion of an interpretation of first-order logic (extended to the many-sorted case) given in (Barwise and Selman [1]).

$\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_2)$ is mapped to a structure $\mathcal{M}_1 = \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g\rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) = \langle k^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2), \langle \sigma_2, \tau_1\rangle, g^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_2)\rangle \in \mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_1)$. The two are linked $\mathcal{M}_2 \underset{\langle k,g\rangle}{\overset{\acute{\chi}_{\mathcal{M}_2}}{\rightleftharpoons}} \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g\rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2)$ by a structure morphism, which is the $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{th}}$ component of a bridge $\boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \overset{\acute{\chi}_{\langle k,g\rangle}}{\rightleftharpoons} \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g\rangle} \circ \boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{U}_1}$.




$$\begin{array}{ccc} k^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2) & \overset{\langle 1_{R_2},k\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \mathcal{E}_2 \\ \langle \sigma_2,\tau_1\rangle \downdownarrows & & \langle \sigma_2,\tau_2\rangle \downdownarrows \\ \sum_g^{-1}(\mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A}_2)) = \mathbf{List}(g^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_2)) & \underbrace{\rightleftharpoons}_{\mathbf{List}(1_{X_2},g)} & \mathbf{List}(\mathcal{A}_2) \end{array}$$

$$\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g\rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) \underset{\langle 1_{R_2},k,1_{X_2},g\rangle}{\overset{(\acute{\chi}_{\langle k,g\rangle})_{\mathcal{M}_2}}{\rightleftharpoons}} \mathcal{M}_2$$

*Multiple Universes.* The Grothedieck construction of the universe indexed mathematical context $\mathbf{Univ}^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}} \mathbf{Cxt}$ is the fibered mathematical context **Struc** of structures and structure morphisms. A structure $\mathcal{M}$ is as described in § 4.3 (Fig. 3). A structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ from source structure $\mathcal{M}_2$ to target structure $\mathcal{M}_1$ consists of a universe morphism $\mathcal{U}_2 \overset{\langle k,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{U}_1$ to target structure $\mathcal{U}_2$ from source structure $\mathcal{U}_1$ and a morphism

$$\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g\rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) = \langle k^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2), \langle \sigma_2,\tau_1\rangle, g^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_2)\rangle \overset{\langle r,f\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \langle \sigma_1,\tau_1\rangle, \mathcal{A}_1\rangle = \mathcal{M}_1$$

in the fiber mathematical context of structures $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_1)$. Hence, a structure morphism satisfies the following conditions.

list preservation

$$\begin{aligned} r \cdot \sigma_1 &= \sigma_2 \cdot \textstyle\sum_f \\ k \cdot \tau_2 &= \tau_1 \cdot \textstyle\sum_g \end{aligned}$$

infomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{rcl} k_1 \models_{\mathcal{E}_1} r(r_2) & \underline{\text{iff}} & k(k_1) \models_{\mathcal{E}_2} r_2 \\ y_1 \models_{\mathcal{A}_1} f(x_2) & \underline{\text{iff}} & g(y_1) \models_{\mathcal{A}_2} x_2 \end{array}$$

Thus, a structure morphism $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ (Fig. 5 in § 4.3) from source structure $\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \langle \sigma_2,\tau_2\rangle, \mathcal{A}_2\rangle$ to target structure $\mathcal{M}_1 = \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \langle \sigma_1,\tau_1\rangle, \mathcal{A}_1\rangle$ is defined in terms of the hypergraph and classification morphisms between the source and target structure components (projections):

$$\begin{array}{rrcl} \textit{universe morphism} & \mathcal{U}_2 = \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle k,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{univ}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{U}_1 \\ \textit{schema morphism} & \mathcal{S}_2 = \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle r,f\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{sch}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{S}_1 \\ \textit{typed domain morphism} & \mathcal{A}_2 = \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle f,g\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{attr}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{A}_1 \\ \textit{entity infomorphism} & \mathcal{E}_2 = \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \overset{\langle r,k\rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{ent}(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{E}_1 \end{array}$$

Structure morphisms compose component-wise. Let **Struc** denote the context of structures and structure morphisms. (Fig. 7 in § 4.3)

**Proposition 2.** *(compare Prop. 1) Any structure morphism* $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle r,k,f,g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$*, with schema morphism projection* $\mathcal{S}_2 \overset{\langle r,f \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{S}_1$ *and universe morphism projection* $\mathcal{U}_2 \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{U}_1$*, has dual factorizations (see the diagram below).*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \overbrace{\qquad\qquad}^{\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_2)} & \\ \mathcal{M}_2 & \overset{\langle k,\, g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1) \\ {\scriptstyle \langle k,\, g \rangle}\big\uparrow\big\downarrow & & \big\uparrow\big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \langle r,\, f \rangle} \\ \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) & \underset{\langle r,\, f \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} & \mathcal{M}_1 \\ & \underbrace{\qquad\qquad}_{\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_1)} & \end{array}$$

*The top-right factorization (corresponding to the schema orientation of § A.2) consists of a* $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{S}_2)$*-morphism* $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ *and the* $\mathcal{M}_1^{th}$ *component* $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_1) \overset{\langle r,f \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$ *of a bridge* $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlywedge}_{\langle r,f \rangle} \circ \boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{S}_2} \overset{\grave{\chi}_{\langle r,f \rangle}}{\Longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{S}_1}$*. The left-bottom factorization (corresponding to the universe orientation of § A.3) consists of the* $\mathcal{M}_2^{th}$ *component* $\mathcal{M}_2 \overset{\langle k,g \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2)$ *of a bridge* $\boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \overset{\acute{\chi}_{\langle k,g \rangle}}{\Longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle} \circ \boldsymbol{inc}_{\mathcal{U}_1}$ *and a* $\mathbf{Struc}(\mathcal{U}_1)$*-morphism* $\boldsymbol{struc}^{\curlyvee}_{\langle k,g \rangle}(\mathcal{M}_2) \overset{\langle r,f \rangle}{\rightleftharpoons} \mathcal{M}_1$*.*

## References


1. Barwise, J., and Seligman, J.: *Information Flow: The Logic of Distributed Systems.*+ Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1997).
2. Chen, P.: "The Entity-Relationship Model - Toward a Unified View of Data". ACM Trans. on Database Sys., 1 (1): pp. 9-36. doi:10.1145/320434.320440.
3. Ganter, B., and Wille, R.: *Formal Concept Analysis: Mathematical Foundations.* Springer, New York (1999).
4. Goguen, J.: *A categorical manifesto.* Mathematical Structures in Computer Science 1, 49–67 (1991).
5. Google authors: "Spanner: Google's Globally-Distributed Database". Available online: `research.google.com/archive/spanner.html`.
6. Gruber, T. "Ontology". In: Ling Liu and M. Tamer Özsu (eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Database Systems*, Springer-Verlag (2009). Available online: `tomgruber.org/writing/ontology-definition-2007.htm`.
7. Kent, R.E.: "Database Semantics". (2011). Available online: `arxiv.org/abs/1209.3054`.
8. Kent, R.E.: "The First-order Logical Environment". In: Pfeiffer, H.D., Ignatov, D.I., Poelmans, J., and Nagarjuna G. (eds.) *Conceptual Structures in Research and Education*, LNCS vol. 7735, pp. 210–230. Springer, Heidelberg (2013). Available online: `arxiv.org/abs/1305.5240`.
9. Kent, R.E.: "The `ERA` of `FOLE`: Superstructure".
10. Kent, R.E.: "The `ERA` of `FOLE`: Interpretation".
11. Sowa, J.F.: *Knowledge Representation: Logical, Philosophical, and Computational Foundations.* Brookes/Coles (2000).
12. Spivak, D.I., and Kent, R.E.: "Ologs: a categorical framework for knowledge representation". PLoS ONE 7(1): e24274. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0024274. (2012). Available online: `arxiv.org/abs/1102.1889`.
13. The Standard Upper Ontology (SUO) working group IEEE P1600.1: *The Information Flow Framework (IFF).* Previously available online: `suo.ieee.org/IFF/`.